DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 228 739 EA 015 589

AUTHOR King, A. L.
TITLE An Examination of Desegregation Court Orders and School District Plans with Regard to Educational Components. Executive Summary of the Final Report. Ways to Improve Schools and Education Project.
INSTITUTION Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Dec 82
CONTRACT 400-80-0107
NOTE 31p.; Portions of text and tables may not reproduce well. For a related document, see EA 015 588.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Compliance (Legal); Desegregation Litigation; *Desegregation Plans; Elementary Secondary Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Multicultural Education; *School Desegregation; School Districts

ABSTRACT

Summarizing a longer companion report, this paper outlines a study concerning educational components in court-ordered desegregation plans in six southwestern states. Twelve components were examined, including inservice education and multicultural education. Data were collected by examining desegregation court orders and district plans for 15 sites. Researchers concluded that court orders or district desegregation plans in this region do not specify educational components in sufficient detail. The author recommended that court orders and district plans should mandate and briefly outline desegregation-specific training and multiethnic programs. (Author/JM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David L. Williams, Jr.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 015 589

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF THE FINAL REPORT: AN EXAMINATION OF DESEGREGATION COURT ORDERS AND SCHOOL DISTRICT PLANS WITH REGARD TO EDUCATIONAL COMPONENTS

Prepared by

A. L. King, Ph.D.

WAYS TO IMPROVE SCHOOLS AND EDUCATION PROJECT
December 1982

DIVISION OF FAMILY, SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY STUDIES
David L. Williams, Jr., Director

Preston C. Kronkosky, Executive Director
Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL)
Austin, Texas

This report is based upon research supported by the National Institute of Education (NIE) under Contract No. 400-80-0107. It represents a summary of the Final Interim Report submitted to NIE for the Ways to Improve Schools and Education Project on November 30, 1982. The statements, findings, and conclusions contained herein are those of authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the funding agency.

Copyrighted 1982 by Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
Austin, Texas

A. INTRODUCTION

In Brown v. The Board of Education of Topeka (1954) the issues were constitutional, moral, and philosophical rather than educational. The question in Brown was whether segregation itself deprives Black children of equal opportunity. A major theme of more than 25 years of federal court decisions has been that the courts' function is to end racial isolation and it is the responsibility of educators and school boards to run the schools.

During the past 20 years, however, judicial remedies to provide equality of educational opportunity have become extremely complex, involving far more than a mere mixing of races. In areas with high proportions of minority populations, it is difficult to desegregate schools. Further, it became apparent that many children need remedial and compensatory education, and courts began to consider this in questions of educational equity.

1. Rationale

There is still much to be done with respect to resolving the issues surrounding school desegregation and educational equity. Many schools still need assistance in providing children with basic skills education. More information and skills are needed by those who have the responsibility of providing quality education for a diverse population of children. Guidelines consistent with sound educational practices are needed for the development and implementation of effective education in a multicultural school setting. This project, Ways to Improve Schools and Education Project (hereafter referred to as WISE or the Project), is concerned with providing information and guidelines for the improvement of education in desegregated or desegregating schools. Desegregation court orders and plans are examined and recommendations are made.

2. Literature Review

Although this study pertains primarily to desegregation of selected schools in the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory (SEDL) six-state region (Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas), the issues involved can be better understood when seen in a broad historical context of common law development in the United States and western culture. Legal and constitutional aspects in the background of this study can be more clearly understood as part of two questions with deep historical roots: (1) the role

of "the state" in education and (2) educational equity as it pertains to racial and ethnic groups. To assist with this understanding, Project staff reviewed major federal court cases and desegregation literature. These reviews are abbreviated in this summary.

a. Federal Court Desegregation Decisions Affecting Educational Programs

In 1954, sixteen southern states--including all six in the SEDL region--and the District of Columbia required racially segregated schools. In that year, in Brown et al. v. The Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas et al., the Supreme Court ordered that the plaintiff Black children be admitted to previously all-White schools. The court's decision reflected the social and psychological factors in the plaintiff testimony, e.g.:

> To separate children from others of similar age and qualifications solely on the basis of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community in a way unlikely ever to be undone.

and:

> We believe that segregation of children in public schools solely on the basis of race, even though the facilities and other tangible factors may be equal, deprives minority children of equal educational opportunities.

Segregation by race, said a unanimous Court, is "inherently unequal."

A review of major decisions indicates five more or less distinct periods in the socio-legal history of desegregation as it has ebbed and flowed. The latest period, 1973-1982, has been and remains a time in which the courts' breadth and flexibility of remedies have been tested. In 1973, the first Supreme Court case for a "northern" school district was heard, Keyes v. School District No. 1, Denver, Colorado. No Colorado law had ever mandated racial segregation of schools; nevertheless, the Court ruled that schools in a section of Denver were unconstitutionally segregated as a result of state and local decisions. The Court found that the Denver school board had confined its growing Black population to a narrow corridor. This was, said the Court, sufficient state action to constitute de jure segregation. On the basis of expert testimony, the Court concluded that the only feasible and constitutionally acceptable remedy--"the only program which furnishes anything approaching substantial equality"--was desegregation "combined with an intense and massive compensatory education program."

It was now clear that not only might forceful remedies be applied in school districts outside the South, but equitable remedy could include court-ordered changes other than mere racial mixing.

After the Keyes decision, other suits filed in the northern and western sections of the country moved forward. Crucial to these decisions was the question of how racial balance stipulating that no school have a majority of Black pupils could be applied to a district with a majority of Black pupils, as in Detroit. A federal district court in Detroit approved a "metropolitan" plan which would desegregate Detroit schools with those in predominantly White suburbs. In Bradley v. Milliken (1974), the district judge designated Detroit and 53 suburban school districts as the "desegregation area" and ordered a plan to desegregate it.

In reviewing the decision, the Supreme Court upheld the findings of de jure segregation in Detroit. But the Court rejected the proposed remedy, ruling that it was beyond the remedial powers of the federal courts because no metropolitan wrong had been established. No metropolitan wrong, no metropolitan remedy. After the Supreme Court ruled against the Bradley v. Milliken remedy of interdistrict desegregation, that district's court formulated a Detroit-only plan that included a number of compensatory and ancillary educational components which were even more sweeping and larger in scope than those ordered in Denver.

Emphasis on South-North differences and de facto-de jure differences have perhaps been over-emphasized. De jure segregation has been proved outside the South, and with so many cities of the North and South having mostly a minority population, differences appear to be more urban-rural. Judicial efforts to achieve equity in education for urban minority students have brought about the courts' emphasis on "educational components" or ancillary remedies in largely minority districts.

b. Research Related to Educational Components in Desegregation

The pace, volume, and quality of research related to desegregation has increased over the past two decades. In their own investigation, as well as their analysis of the research of others, Meyer Weinberg, Thomas Pettigrew and others point out the need for, and the benefits of, desegregation for majority as well as minority students, and call for school improvements to meet students' needs. Research by others, such as David Armor and Christopher

Jencks emphasize the damaging influences of low socio-economic status and poor home conditions and assert that schools can do little to overcome these factors. In her important meta-analysis, St. John (2975) reviewed the methodology and findings of 120 reports on the effects of desegregation on children. She stresses the complex, multifaceted nature of desegregation which, under various conditions she identified, could have either positive or negative results for children.

Findings from numerous desegregation studies have been published during 1981 and 1982, adding considerably to the knowledge about the effectiveness of school desegregation strategies. Many of their findings relate directly to the need for, and development of, educational components in desegregated schools.

3. Statement of the Problem

There is a need for an examination of court orders for educational components related to school desegregation. The need for reports on findings from such an examination is likely to become more acute for state and local educational agencies. The prospect in the 1980's is for fewer guidelines and less support for desegregation from the federal executive and legislative branches, while state and local agencies will nevertheless be required to meet desegregation and equal education mandates from the federal judiciary. It is apparent also that judges and litigants need clearer information and guidelines for designing, implementing, and monitoring desegregation plans, especially those with educational programs and policies.

The hypothesis on which this study is based is that:

> Court-ordered desegregation plans in the SEDL region do not specify educational components (e.g., multicultural education and inservice education) in sufficient detail for use by desegregating and/or desegregated schools and districts. And conversely, school district plans do not contain sufficient detail about educational components for the courts to decide whether the district is in compliance.

4. Goal and Objectives

The goal of this project is:

> To produce a set of findings and recommendations with regard to the inclusion of educational programs and inservice education in court-ordered school desegregation plans. This will be done by examining court-mandated plans in the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory region to determine the extent to which they include or omit instructions for educa-

tional programs and inservice education and by comparing these with the Ways to Improve Education in Desegregated Schools Process Model and Guidelines for Inservice Education, Multicultural Education, and Desegregation. These findings and recommendations will be for consideration by and use of legal, judicial, and educational personnel and others interested and/or involved in litigating, planning, implementing, or monitoring school desegregation.

5. Limitations

There are four limitations inherent in this study. Three of these relate to the restriction of the Project primarily to an analysis of the court orders and mandated desegregation plans. These three are: (1) differences in degree of precision of language used in the various orders and plans; (2) the inability to determine whether an educational component might have been infrequently mandated because (a) its use was considered poor strategy, (b) the court felt constrained to observe certain conditions, or (c) other factors; and (3) the inability to determine, in all cases, whether mandated components are being or have been actually implemented and if so, how effectively.

Given the goal and objectives of this project, however, i.e., to examine desegregation court orders and plans for the presence or absence of educational components, these are not serious limitations. Further, the study used additional research procedures beyond documentary analysis of court orders and plans. These were: (1) interviews with plaintiff and defense attorneys involved in the cases, and (2) site visits to schools ordered to implement the plans. Information from these procedures helped to (1) clarify language used in the components and (2) determine why more educational components were not included, as well as (3) gain some insight into implementation of mandated educational components.

A fourth limitation relates to the small number of cases (n = 15). However, perusal of other desegregation cases from in and outside the six-state region, as well as the review of the literature, indicate that the 15 cases in the study were not atypical. Because sample size precluded rigorous quantitative analysis techniques, a strategy of qualitative analysis was used.

B. METHODOLOGY

1. Documents and Sites

Sets of desegregation court orders and district plans were collected for 15 sites in the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory six-state region

(Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas). Sites were selected on the basis of criteria developed to assure certain demographic and geographic variety rather than for similar characteristics. The sites are bi-ethnic (Black-White and Hispanic-Anglo) and tri-ethnic (Black-Hispanic-Anglo and Black-Native American-Anglo), as well as urban, suburban, and rural. Student enrollments range from about 50,000 to about 4,000.

2. Description of Instruments

A detailed Checklist was developed, tested, revised for maximum inter-rater reliability and revised for the examination of the data. Major headings of the Checklist were made up of educational components identified in the literature and earlier phases of the WISE Project as important to effective desegregation. These components are similar to those prescribed in Milliken v. Bradley "as educational components designed both to equalize the delivery of educational services at all schools and to restore quality education, which has deteriorated due to past acts of discrimination." These components are included in Table 1.

A Data Tabulation Matrix was constructed by modifying a Checklist. Analysis of the court orders and plans identified each technique used to implement a component (for example, a bilingual-bicultural program as a technique within the curricular component). Any technique used was listed under its respective component. The Tabulation Matrix was also designed to indicate the grade level (elementary, junior high/middle school, and/or high school). Coded entries on the Matrix indicated how many times a technique was used, in what school district, and at what level.

3. Procedures

Each court order was examined as a mandate to establish a unitary school district. Each plan was examined as a document which showed how the district was to carry out the mandate. Both documents thus should set some standards and/or give some guidance to persons charged with the responsibility of carrying out the order or implementing the plan. Project staff examined each set of desegregation court orders and plans, making appropriate entries on the Checklist. The Checklist helped to plot the presence, absence, and frequency of occurrence for each item on the list. Each court order and plan was examined independently by staff members. Discrepancies regarding interpretations were resolved through a group examination of and

conference about the court order or plan in question. Data were recorded and tabulated with the use of the Data Tabulation Matrix. Additional information was gathered by observations of inservice education (IE) at two of the sites, interviews with staff of the sites, and interviews with four attorneys.

C. RESULTS

1. Description of Techniques Used

In order to test this study's hypothesis that court-ordered desegregation plans in the SEDL region do not specify educational components in sufficient detail for their use by desegregated/desegregating schools and districts, two qualitative research techniques were used: (1) descriptive and (2) comparative.

Each court order and district plan underwent a thorough descriptive content analysis. Where possible, the link from court order to district plan to inservice to implement the component was shown. Each time a technique of an educational component was found in an order or plan, an entry describing that technique was recorded in the appropriate cell of the Checklist. This linked the technique with one and sometimes two educational components (because the magnet school technique was classified as a component, it fit with three components--magnet, quality education, and student reassignment).

2. Discussion of the Findings

The following discussion of findings with regard to educational components in desegregation court orders and district plans is organized according to the 12 components (Table 1). Student and faculty assignment components are included in this study for two reasons: (a) particular techniques of these components can affect desegregation outcomes, including educational benefits, and (b) the Project wanted to examine the possibility of relationships between these techniques and other components examined.

For each component discussed there is (1) a definition and/or description of that component, (2) a brief discussion of what research has said about the usefulness of that component and whether it is recommended by research findings for inclusion in the preparation for desegregation, and (3) the extent to which that component is included in the court orders and plans examined in this study.

a. Student Reassignment

There are degrees of desegregation; differing amounts are acceptable to the courts, depending upon circumstances. The general constitutional

TABLE 1

EDUCATIONAL COMPONENTS FOUND IN DESEGREGATION COURT ORDERS AND PLANS, WITH FREQUENCIES OF USE OF EACH COMPONENT AND TECHNIQUES TO IMPLEMENT COMPONENTS

Components	No. of Techniques Used for Each Component	Total Frequencies of Use
Student Reassignment	12	90
Faculty Reassignment	5	19
Quality of Education	6	8
Multicultural Education	4	4
Curriculum	14	17
Magnet Schools	8	9
Extracurricular Activities	4	5
Counseling	4	5
Discipline	5	5
Local Needs/Conditions	4	11
Parent Involvement/Community Relations	16	19
Inservice Education	6	9
TOTALS	98	201

standard, established by the U. S. Supreme Court is "the maximum amount of actual desegregation in light of the practicalities of the local situation" (Green v. New Kent County, 1968; also Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg, 1971). Other than in the establishment of a violation, most of the testimony in desegregation cases concerns student reassignment.

Because techniques apparently have impact on educational outcomes, there has been considerable research, and even more argument, with regard to "mixing" techniques. For example, the Hawley and others' (April 1981) synthesis of findings on Strategies for Effective Desegregation contains almost the same amount of discussion on the physical aspects of desegregation outside the school (student assignment and neighborhoods) as to structural, organizational, and curriculum concerns - 55 pages to 56 pages, respectively.

Some popular conceptions of racial issues in desegregation need to be questioned; for example, Crain et al. (1982) found that there is no such thing as an ideal racial composition. Other research findings indicate

that desegregation enhances minority achievement and does not diminish that of majority students (Rossell et al., April 1981). For enhancement of achievement test scores, development test scores, development of positive race relations, and prevention of resegregation ("White flight"), desegregation should: begin in the earliest grade possible, include all grades, and not be voluntary (Coleman, 1966; Katz, 1976; Rossell, 1978; Hawley et al., April 1981; Rossell et al., April 1981; Crain et al., 1982).

Research findings indicate that although it should not be used as a reason not to desegregate, stability should be a consideration in planning desegregation. Stability, as promoted in the following list of strategies, promotes the student's education as well as tending to promote family and community support for desegregation and confidence in the schools.

- Preserve "neighborhood" schools which are desegregated or are moving toward desegregation.
- In larger districts when possible maintain a neighborhood element by subdividing the district into smaller, racially balanced sub-districts with reassignment only within those sub-districts. This approach may reduce options for racial balance so severely in some districts that it is not feasible, but it is an approach which should be considered.
- Changes for individual students and student cohorts should be minimized. This means moving as few students as possible; if they must be moved, move as large a segment of cohorts as possible.
- Keep students of the same family together so far as feasible.
- Bus only as many children as necessary and as far as necessary to achieve desegregation.
- A phasing-in plan should be avoided as it tends to increase White flight, especially in a community with a history of strained race relations and/or opposition to desegregation.
- Desegregation plans should promote social class integration as well as racial/ethnic integration.
- School authorities responsible for implementing desegregation should also implement a program of informing the public about the benefits of desegregation and should reassure parents that the safety and welfare of the children will be attended to during desegregation.
- School building and other facilities should be in good repair; i.e., no student should be re-assigned to a school which is perceived by parents and the community as having inferior facilities.
- No student should experience a down-grading of quality of instruction or be deprived of educational benefits because of desegregation.

Examination of the court orders and plans pertaining to desegregation of the 15 selected schools in Project WISE discloses the use of 12 different

student reassignment techniques. Most of these techniques were used by one or two of the three grade levels, and ten were used in plans specifying their use at all levels. Other than busing, which is used for desegregation in conjunction with other reassignment techniques, the most popular of the 12 techniques for student mixing were changing attendance zones, pairing and/or clustering, and some form of random reassignment. The next most commonly used assignment plan was that of grade centers (e.g., designating a previously Black elementary school (1-6) to a school attended only by sixth grade minority and majority pupils).

In many school districts, putting an end to racial isolation requires transporting some students of one or more racial groups. Busing of both minority and majority students in a district is two-way busing. In one-way busing, it is usually a minority group which is transported. Hawley et al. (April 1981) found no empirical evidence that one-way busing is "harmful." It is probably no more harmful to the group bused than it is to those involved in two-way busing. Crain et al. (1982) found that in any busing, those bused may have a sense of not belonging in the school, may suffer loss of self-esteem, and the quality of racial contact may be harmed unless steps are taken to counteract these results. Appropriate IE and multicultural education programs are the two most important steps in preventing negative effects. Most desegregation experts interviewed by Broh and Trent in 1981 generally advocated two-way busing because of equity questions and longer-term minority community support for desegregation. In a study of desegregated schools in southwestern states, King in 1981 found no long-term problems resulting from either one-way or two-way busing.

Busing was used with several student reassignment techniques in the 15 plans studied. Interestingly, busing was not used in any district plan for high schools alone but was used in one district at the elementary level only and in another at the junior high level only. Busing was used in seven districts across all three levels. Although not specified in its plan, one of the two voluntary desegregation districts in this study also had bused a significant number of its students for desegregation.

b. Faculty Reassignment

In a school with a desegregated student body and an all-Anglo teaching staff, there are likely to be (1) more second generation desegregation

problems, and (2) more difficulty in obtaining good student achievement and preparing students for adult roles. Further, it seems clear that minority students, as well as majority students, see role models of their same race in positions of authority. It is also clear, however, that many teachers are as effective with other-race students than some teachers are with same-race students. Thus, the available evidence shows that desegregated schools should have desegregated staffs. Quantitative research findings also indicate that the school staffs should have IE to prepare them to interact with diverse student populations. The benefits of having a trained, desegregated staff include improvements in (1) race relations, (2) minority self-esteem and achievement, and (3) student-faculty communication, as well as providing minority children with significant others of their own race. Qualitative literature also supports these findings and adds that desegregating the staff could help improve public response to school desegregation.

As is common in school desegregation, school districts in this study used fewer techniques (five) for faculty reassignment than for student reassignment (twelve). The school district plans generally specified no faculty desegregation other than that contained in the order. One district did, however, reorganize its administrative structure at the junior high and high school levels without an order.

The technique used most frequently to reassign faculty is actually a standard set forth originally in the case of Singleton v. Jackson Municipal Separate School District (1970). The basic Singleton criterion is that the district's minority and majority staff be reassigned so that they are substantially the same ratio in each school as is the ratio of minority to majority staff in the entire district.

c. Quality of Education

The working definition of quality of education used in this study was:

> Quality education...is the outcome of effective schools and includes a range of experiences that (1) focus on learner academic achievement, (2) employ a variety of teaching methods (3) promote learning on the part of all students, (4) take into account individual differences, and (5) produce learner competencies in terms of measurable knowledge and skill outcomes.

This definition is compatible with the discussion of quality of education in research literature on effective schooling (Westbrook, 1982) and is

useful in this study. The concept of "quality education" or "quality of education" is frequently mentioned and sometimes discussed, without a definition or standard for measurement, in desegregation research literature, cases, orders, and plans.

When quality education is mentioned with regard to desegregation, it is often used in one of two ways: (1) as one of desegregation's two overarching goals, along with educational equity (e.g., Chesler et al., 1981), or (2) by critics of desegregation who say that the two concepts, desegregation and quality education, are antithetical. Most desegregation experts believe that quality education is not only desirable and attainable, but should be an essential component of desegregation. Stollee (July 1979), however, has pointed out that the Supreme Court has held that the Fourteenth Amendment does not guarantee high quality of education but only equal access to whatever quality of education a given school system provides.

Stollee, an education professor and desegregation planner, maintains that when desegregation is ordered, the school boards are usually so busy working on plans at the last minute, and have such short time for quality planning allowed for, that quality education suffers from inattention, and the public cries out that desegregation has ruined the schools.

Much of the literature is aimed at helping the policy makers and practitioners in their efforts to upgrade education. Forehand and Ragosta premised their research and their Handbook for Integrated Schooling (July 1976) on the assumptions: (1) that schooling will and should be integrated and (2) there are positive actions that can be taken to maximize the educational benefits of integrated schooling. St. John (1975) pointed out the need to maximize school conditions which maximize benefits for children. Some, more quantitative researchers, define improvements in educational quality as shown on scores of standardized tests of verbal and quantitative skills.

Eleven times, in two court orders and four of the fifteen district plans, the term or concept of quality education appeared. These are listed below.

- maintain an improved quality of education and level of consideration for all pupils
- use of assistance of the state and the district in achieving "present levels of quality"
- a viable educational program will "greatly improve the quality of education"

- reorganization of the district "to provide a quality education for every student"
- "maintain an improved quality of education and level of consideration for all pupils"
- to improve the quality of education with lowered pupil-teacher ratio in desegregated classes
- quality of education is improved when the "arts are related to each other and to other disciplines," and when "arts are used to create learning situations which help reduce personal and racial isolation and increase self-esteem"
- magnet school concept to improve quality of education (used three times)

d. Multicultural Education

Multicultural Education - multi-culturalism, or cultural pluralism, is a view of the larger society being made up of a number of cultures which are different but none is superior to any other and each is equally respected. Multicultural education includes instruction and curricula which foster a world view of cultural pluralism. Multicultural instruction takes into account the individual's culture as well as other aspects of his/her background which are relevant to the student's dignity, needs, and learning styles. Multicultural curriculum is relevant to local as well as national cultures, and meets the individual's need to know of his/her own culture as well as those of others.

Multicultural education is a more comprehensive concept than multi-ethnic education which is limited to the concerns of racial and ethnic groups. Multicultural education is a set of experiences in a setting which promotes educational equity for a wider range of cultural groups, including gender, handicap, age, and socio-economic status.

Considerable research has been conducted with regard to multicultural education and its effects. Literature reviewed by Project WISE supports an assertion that multicultural education is crucial to educational equity for all students and should thus be reflected in all of a school's programs and general atmsophere. Katz (1964) concluded from his review of desegregation studies that the several factors that influenced Black students' academic performance included social conditions in the school and classroom, the degrees of acceptance by significant others (particularly White teachers and peers), and the Black pupil's self-concept in regard to the probability of social and academic success or failure. After her early review of desegregation/integration research, St. John (February 1970) concluded that

the most plausible hypothesis was that the relation between desegregation and achievement is conditional, and that the academic performance of minority group children will be higher in integrated than in equivalent segregated schools, provided that they are supported by staff and accepted by peers.

The behavior and attitude of teachers and other school staff should reflect an appreciation of the various cultures represented by the school's diverse student body. Since 1970 there has been a growing pool of empirical research available on the correlation between the behavior and attitudes of teachers and the attitudes and academic performance of pupils, as well as how to improve the performance. These studies indicate that White students receive more praise, encouragement, and opportunities for substantive interaction with teachers, while teacher contacts with minority students are mostly procedural, negative, and disciplinary. The findings strongly suggest that student ethnicity is one of the major determinants of teachers' attitudes and behavior toward their students; that teachers, including minority teachers, expect less of minority students and give them fewer opportunities and less encouragement and positive feedback; that these conditions are detrimental to the quality of education; and that many minority children are thus denied equal opportunity for quality education.

Howsam et al. pointed out the need for training to implement multicultural education. In their Educating a Profession (1976), they recognized that most educators were reared in middle- or lower middle-class homes and communities, away from minority and lower socio-economic groups. The seriousness of this situation was recognized and pointed out by the board of directors of teacher preparation institutions themselves, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE, 1976). They observed that most teachers did not have adequate knowledge of the various cultural systems from which their pupils come, and it had been assumed for too long that any "good teacher" could provide for the learning needs of children from diverse cultural backgrounds. As evidenced in low student achievement rates, said the AACTE, there was an impelling need for reform.

The lack of multicultural education for and by educators undoubtedly contributes to what have been called second generation desegregation problems. Arising after the physical desegregation of students and staff, these problems prevent schools from providing effective education for all

students. They can be characterized as acts of omission or commission that continue discrimination or effects of past discrimination against minority groups.

Although their impact is destructive, such negative attitudes and behavior receive less attention perhaps because they are not so overt as a stated policy that maintains a segregated school district. Some second generation problems are: (1) reduction of public support for desegregated public schools, as shown especially by resegregation or White flight; (2) segregation of students within "desegregated" schools; (3) retention of segregated or mono-cultural curricula; (4) placement of disproportionate numbers of minority students in special education classes or lowest academic "tracts"; (5) suspension, expulsion, or other punishment of disproportionately high percentages of minority students.

Desegregation literature on education is replete with studies, reports, and monographs indicating the need for effective multicultural education. After analyzing 120 studies of school desegregation, St. John (1975) concluded that further investigation of the general question--"Does desegregation benefit children?"--would seem a waste of resources. Rather, the pressing need is to discover the school conditions under which the benefits of mixed schooling are maximized and its hardships minimized. It is important to note that these conditions are not unique to success for minority students in a desegregated setting, but are vitally important to academic success for anyone in an educational setting. From these studies it may be concluded that in an integrated, multicultural setting: (1) academic achievement rises for the minority children while relatively advantaged majority children continue to learn at the same or higher rate, (2) minority children may gain a more positive self-concept, and (3) positive racial attitudes by minority and majority students develop as they attend school together.

None of the court orders examined by the Project were found to include any use of the term or concept of multicultural education. Few instances of its use were indicated in the district plans. At the elementary level, one district specified the use of minority as well as majority artists to help teach pupils about different local cultures, but this evidently occurred only in magnet schools. In another district's 1969 plan, it was stated that every secondary teacher would participate in the preparation of bibliographies

and instructional materials on Black culture, and every elementary level teacher would develop a social studies "course on human relations." Recent interviews of district faculty, staff, and parents indicated that not only was this implemented, but more multicultural education has gradually developed since then.

One of the districts with a volunteer plan stipulated that a bilingual-bicultural (Spanish-English, Hispanic-Anglo) program would be implemented. Interviews with school personnel in the other four districts with Hispanic enrollments indicated that each has at least one bilingual-bicultural program in operation there, though not stipulated in their desegregation plans.

e. Curriculum

Most curricular changes brought about by desegregation have been in the nature of compensatory and remedial education. These are programs intended to remove former inequities and to equalize educational opportunities among socio-economic and ethnic groups. Beginning in 1964 when Congress passed the Economic Opportunity Act, numerous federal and state educational programs have been enacted in the interest of achieving equity in educational benefits for various populations. Judicial action has also caused compensatory services to be provided for poor, low-achieving pupils and for pupils in racially isolated and newly desegregated schools.

As intended, these compensatory education programs serve primarily minority students, who are disproportionately represented in low-income and low-achieving categories. This minority over-representation and the reliance of many compensatory programs on pulling the students being served out of regular classrooms, result in the segregation of some minority students within otherwise desegregated schools. The compensatory programs have been generally popular with school districts, and many school administrators, especially those in urban districts, say that such programs are essential to attaining quality education.

A wide variety of curricular techniques were used in the plans which were examined. More curricular desegregation strategies were used at the elementary level than at any other. Seven of the 11 elementary curricular desegregation techniques, including most of a compensatory nature, were concentrated in one district's plan. This same district was the only one with a plan specifying curricular techniques at the junior high/middle school

level and it also accounted for one of the two strategies used at the high school only level.

The popularity of compensatory programs are not reflected in the desegregation plans examined by WISE. Most compensatory education funds are awarded to districts after their desegregation plan is accepted. Interviews with personnel in the Project school districts indicate that each district has had at least one compensatory program since desegregation, and the districts with Hispanic enrollment have a bilingual program.

f. Magnet Schools

The magnet school concept is used as a student reassignment technique, because such a school has a distinctive program of study that will attract a voluntary cross section of students from all racial groups in the district. Distinctive program themes have featured gifted and/or talented student programs, vocational education, the arts, science and math, basics, foreign language, and humanities. Most are used only at the secondary levels. Although not in its plan, one district offers computer literacy to students in two elementary schools to help desegregate them.

There is controversy among desegregation consultants and researchers about the use of magnet schools as a technique for ending racial isolation. Foster (August 1972) has termed it a "spurious technique" because it produces little desegregation and tends to usurp funds and the better staff from other schools. Others, as Levine and Havighurst (1977), admit that it has limitations, such as not offering enough program options and producing pressure from non-magnet schools which also want program improvements, but cite advantages such as helping to avoid White flight. There is agreement that White students are less likely to enroll in magnet schools in minority neighborhoods, although the reverse is not the case.

Courts have become generally skeptical of magnet-only plans, especially in districts with sizeable minority student enrollment. In the court orders examined by the Project, judges authorized the use of magnets in five instances. One district established a magnet elementary school with a number of instructional and curricular innovations to attract a range of students. At the junior high/middle school level, one district established a program of individualized instruction. Both programs are reported in interviews to have brought some desegregation to the schools. At the high school only

level, a computer science center and medical technology program is increasing in tri-ethnic enrollment.

g. Extracurricular Activities

"Extracurricular activities" are all school-sponsored activities other than those directly related to curricular and instructional programs. Extracurricular activities include, for example, student govenment, band, sports other than physical education classes, and math clubs. Since Allport's (1954) findings, it is more and more commonly accepted that improved race relations can be accomplished through personal contacts between different race students under certain conditions which include equal status and cooperation toward a common goal. Findings indicate that an effective extracurricular program will not only strengthen race relations, but also will improve student morale, which in turn tends to help improve academic achievement.

Only one of the court orders examined by the Project spoke to the desegregation of extracurricular activities, specifying that nowhere in the district would there be any racial barrier to any student participation. No directive for affirmative action was issued. One school plan indicated that "special efforts" would be made to desegregate staff in "specialized areas" such as "head coaches, band and choral directors, etc." Another district's plan promised that all extracurricular activities and facilities were to be used on nondiscriminatory bases.

IE is important for the effective desegregation of extracurricular activities for several reasons. First, there is a general training for cultural awareness and race relations which are desirable for all school staff. Specialized training is also needed for staff with responsibilities in extracurricular activities. Such IE should include awareness of the importance of extracurricular activities in school desegregation, and procedures to desegregate and integrate their respective activity. These procedures would involve, for example, recruitment of participants so that all school racial/ethnic groups are represented in each activity.

h. Counseling and Career Guidance

Integration of its counseling program has important implications for desegregating a school. The large field of research on the subject indicates that minority students in the school will probably benefit from having counselors of their race. These benefits for minority students include:

(1) more of them will complete high school, (2) they will be better informed about available scholarships and admission procedures, and (3) they will tend to have successful college experiences.

Inservice education is needed for minority and majority counselors. All counselors need to be aware of financial aid and educational opportunities at traditionally Black colleges and at traditionally Anglo colleges. This awareness is only part of the IE necessary for effective cross-cultural counseling. Counseling requires that counselors relate to individuals rather than to stereotypic members of generalized groups. Misuse of the concept of culture generally results from too little information about cultures. Multicultural IE for counselors can help prevent the negative effects which result from counseling based on stereotypes and can prepare the counselors to help their clients reduce their cultural prejudices. Counselors may also need IE for multicultural awareness in testing and assessment practices. The misuse of testing and assessment instruments and practices standardized according to a particular socio-economic and cultural group has serious negative implications for equal educational opportunity.

All school staff members should have a general awareness of the nature of prejudice. Counselors have a particular need to be well-informed about the psychology of racism and how to help students and other staff change prejudiced attitudes and behavior. As well-informed staff members, counselors can be valuable resources for the IE of other school staff.

Counseling was mentioned in only one of the court orders examined. It directed the district to "serve the special needs and problems of Negro students." Nothing was spelled out in that district's plan as to how the mandate would be implemented. The counseling provisions in four other plans were vague. One plan said the district would counsel minority students "with potential for higher achievement" to take higher math and science courses. In another, the district said that the previously separate Black and White high school guidance departments "will begin to jointly plan revisions" in a new, desegregated guidance program.

i. Discipline

After desegregation, minority students are commonly suspended and expelled in disproportionate numbers. A great deal is known about how to limit student expulsion and suspension, but few of these findings are

reflected in the court orders and district plans examined in the Project. One district plan indicated that order and discipline would be maintained in all schools. Only one district provided any detail with regard to discipline/punishment procedures, giving four related points:

- Every student will have due process before suspension
- Minority students not to be disproportionately subject to disciplinary measures
- Suspension policies to conform to Goss v. Lopez
- Disciplinary measures to be equal and uniform throughout the district.

j. Local Needs and Conditions

Local needs and conditions which should be considered include primarily social, economic, political, demographic, and geographic issues. Many of these needs and conditions have to do with school-community and school-parent relations, but these should not displace student needs if there is a conflict. Student needs should receive first priority, and community and home relations considerations next. In many instances local needs and considerations will coincide with student needs as discussed with Student Reassignment.

The literature strongly suggests that most of the attention given to local needs/conditions in desegregation planning has been at the district level, less attention given to the school level, and virtually none at the classroom level. It appears that this situation adds to the burdens and responsibilities of building-level administrators and classroom teachers, insofar as the likelihood of problems is increased at those levels when not attended to in the plan. It follows then that these principals and teachers need more IE support in dealing with the problems.

Other than in student reassignment techniques and curricular concerns already discussed, little about local needs and conditions was in the examined orders or plans. What was included, was information on a district-wide level, rather than by individual school or grade level. These court orders contain some mention of local needs. One order simply called attention to "community apprehension" about the desegregation process. The two others mandated the appointment of a bi-racial and tri-racial committee to advise their respective districts in drawing up and implementing the plan. Two district plans specified the use of tri-ethnic committees to

assist the board in formulating and implementing the plan.

k. Parent Involvement or Community Relations

The importance of parental involvement in school desegregation, from the standpoint of the individual student's well-being as well as the standpoint of successful desegregation, is well documented. The need for community involvement and support in the desegregation process is also clearly recognized. It may be that community support is the key to success for effective desegregation, and a number of guides exist for helping to promote both parental and community involvement and support for effective desegregation.

The importance of parent and community involvement in--or at least, support for--desegregation was apparent in a number of the court orders and plans examined. In 11 instances trial judges called attention to the need for concern about parental or community support. Four of the court-mandated techniques required the appointment of an individual or group of individuals to serve as conduits of communication:

- Tri-ethnic committee (2)
- Bi-ethnic committee (3)
- Director of public relations (1)
- Committee to discuss...(1)

It seems apparent that the groups were intended also to provide community input in the desegregation process.

The districts' plans contained all of the court-mandated techniques plus others for the communication and cooperation with parents and/or community:

- Parent orientation at their children's school
- Public meetings to review zonings and hear protests or comments
- Child study groups to include parents
- Teacher-parent conferences (2)
- School-home visits
- Family homework policy

l. Inservice Education

Most school staffs are not prepared for the new experiences brought by desegregation. As already discussed with other components, many if not most educators are unfamiliar with their new students and new group dynamics to be dealt with as a result of desegregation. Some inservice is necessary

just to become familiar with the details of the desegregation plan. Well-planned and implemented training programs are also necessary to provide knowledge and skills, as well as support, to cope with change itself.

Hawley et al. (April 1981) makes a reasonable argument that if training for desegregation influences change in participants' attitudes, behaviors, and skills, those developments will result in changes in school climate. These changes in school climate will in turn facilitate improvement of student attitudes, behavior, and achievement. Helpful guidelines as to appropriate inservice content do exist as do guidelines for effective operation of training programs (e.g., the Ways to Improve Education in Desgregated Schools Handbook...for Training, Multicultural Education, and Desegregation, 1982).

Only one court order mandated inservice training; that was in human relations. One other district, not ordered to do so, also called for human relations training for staff across all levels. That second district also specified training across all grade levels in cultural awareness, stereotyping, race relations, and evaluation and use of multiethnic materials. Two other districts indicated orientation for desegregation and one called for training to implement desegregation. Only one other district stated in its plan that it would train any of its staff. It specified social studies training for its elementary teachers.

In summary, four districts' plans included sufficient guidance for IE as to form a firm basis for training for at least a portion of the staff (generally teachers). The other 11 districts' plans, however, did not provide adequate guidance for desegregation-related inservice education.

D. CONCLUSIONS

As indicated in Table 2 the Project's 15 site districts include eight Black and White, one Hispanic-Anglo, four Black-Hispanic-Anglo, and two Black-Native American-Anglo districts. Each racial/ethnic group included makes up at least nine percent of the enrollment in their respective districts. Table 2 also displays cells of groupings by component usage.

This table indicates some of the tentative conclusions which can be drawn from this study. The school desegregation plans with the highest overall average use of educational components were those involving Hispanic-Anglo (one district, 9 uses) and Black-Hispanic-Anglo (four districts with

TABLE 2

FREQUENCIES OF USE OF TECHNIQUES USED WITHIN COMPONENTS (OMITTING STUDENT AND FACULTY REASSIGNMENT) BY ETHNIC GROUPS OF DISTRICTS

ETHNIC GROUPING OF DISTRICTS	TECHNIQUES WITHIN EDUCATIONAL COMPONENT (Combined orders and plans)	Quality of Education	Multi-cultural Education	Curriculum	Magnet School	Extracurricular	Counseling	Discipline	Local Needs/Conditions	Parent Involvement/Community Relations	Inservice Education	TOTAL	*AVERAGES OF COMPONENT USE BY EACH COMPONENT IN GROUPING
BI-ETHNIC													
Black - White (8 Districts)		1	2	2	7	3	2	1	6	8	6	38	4.75
Hispanic - Anglo (1 District)		0	1	1	0	0	1	4	1	1	0	9	9.00
TRI-ETHNIC													
Black - Hispanic - Anglo (4 Districts)		7	1	13	2	2	1	0	2	10	3	41	10.25
Black - Native American - Anglo (2 Districts)		0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	1.50
TOTALS		8	4	17	9	5	4	5	11	19	9	91	

*Averages are computed by dividing the number of districts within the ethnic grouping into the total uses of component techniques by the districts in that grouping.

an average of 10.25 uses per district) racial grouping. More than half of the uses (23 of 41) by the Black-Hispanic-Anglo districts were concentrated in two components, Curriculum (13 uses) and Parent Involvement/Community Relations (10 uses). This tends to be consistent with the literature stressing parent involvement and community relations for all effective school desegregation, but especially for desegregation involving Hispanic students. It is important for all students, but it seems to be particularly important for effective desegregation experiences for Hispanic students that their parents and community members participate in planning and implementing their desegregated educational programs.

The eight Black-White school districts had the second highest use (eight uses) of Parent Involvement/Community Relations. This averages to about one use per district. But these districts are also involved in six usages of "local needs/conditions," and they had the highest usage of the magnet school component. The relatively high use of this combination of these three components--parent involvement/community relations, local needs/conditions, and magnet schools--may indicate that the courts and the districts were sensitive to potential White flight. Magnet schools are essentially an effort to draw White students to attend school with minorities.

Lowest average use of educational components (1.50) was in the two Black-Native American-Anglo districts. There is but little literature on effective desegregation of school districts including Native American students, either in urban or rural areas. Native American students suffer the highest incidence of dropout and other second generation desegregation problems, and more research is needed with regard to educational components to fit Native American needs.

The district desegregation plans included only nine uses of inservice education for school staff. Six of these uses were in the eight Black-White districts, and the other three uses were in the four Black-Hispanic-Anglo districts. Thus, the average use in both of these groupings was only .75 per district. Only one court order mandated inservice training, and this included no mention of scope, content, or audience. Only four districts included sufficient guidance for IE to form a basis for training any staff, and this was generally restricted to teachers.

It is not to be expected that full-blown inservice programs will be embodied in desegregation court orders or district plans. It does appear that orders and plans should specify that there will be desegregation-specific training and indicate general outlines, participation, and content of the program.

The use of multicultural education (four uses) and curriculum revision (17 uses) as techniques related to desegregation was restricted primarily to four magnet schools. It could not be expected, therefore, that most of the students in those districts with magnet schools, much less those students in districts without such schools, would necessarily receive the benefits of multicultural education or an integrated curriculum. The court orders and district plans provided even less guidance on extracurricular activities, counseling, and discipline components. Unless these components are effectively implemented in desegregated schools, there are likely to be second generation desegregation problems in each of them.

The hypothesis for this study:

- Court-ordered desegregation plans in the SEDL region do not specify educational components (e.g., multicultural education and inservice education) in sufficient detail for use by desegregating and/or desegregated schools and districts, and conversely, school district plans do not

contain sufficient detail about educational components for the courts to decide whether the district is in compliance.

appears to be supported by the data.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Responsibility for the lack of educational components in desegregation should be shared. Defendant districts should take more initiative in designing and implementing educational components in desegregated/desegregating schools. Plaintiffs, on the other hand, should be more specific in asking the courts for remedies; judges can rule only on what is asked for.

- More needs to be known about how to get what is known about good practices put into general use in desegregated schools. There are at least seven audiences who can create or at least influence such desegregation policies and practices. These are: (1) the plaintiffs and their attorneys in school desegregation suits, (2) judges, (3) school administrators, (4) classroom teachers, (5) parents and other citizens, (6) federal and state program administrators, and (7) federal, state, and local legislators.

- Ways need to be found to harness state resources with local desegregation efforts. Here, also, varied audiences need to be addressed--chief state school officers, state board of education members, and chairpersons of educational committees in the legislatures.

- Although much is known about what works in effective desegregation and integration and why it works, more research on effective practices is needed. Appropriate research questions no longer include "should schools be desegregated?' or "does desegregation work?" Rather, such questions as "how can schools best be integrated?" or, more specifically, "what conditions are necessary to bring about integration for a mixture of particular groups of students?" and "how can these conditions be brought about?" This research is especially needed where Native American students and tri-ethnic desegregation are involved.

- More research is needed to investigate the implications of desegregated/desegregating school improvement efforts for schools in general. Identification of practices which are successful in desegregated and/or desegregating schools seem likely to have implications for general educational processes and their outcomes. These practices include, inter alia, paying

attention to the importance of student self-esteem, promoting positive teacher attitudes and behavior toward students, and having a school climate that accepts individual and group differences.

F. REFERENCES

Allport, Gordon W. The Nature of Prejudice. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Multicultural Education and Ethnic Studies in the U.S.: An Analysis and Annotated Bibliography of Selected Documents in ERIC. Washington, D.C.: AACTE and ERIC, 1976.

Armor, David J. "White Flight and the Future of School Desegregation," in W. G. Stephan and J. R. Feagin, eds., Desegregation: Past, Present, and Future. New York: Plenum Press, 1980.

Bron, C. Anthony, and William T. Trent. Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies. Volume VI: Qualitative Literature and Expert Opinion on School Desegregation. Nashville, Tenn: Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University, April 1981.

Coleman, James S., et al. Equality of Educational Opportunity. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1966.

Crain, Robert L., et al. Making Desegregation Work: How Schools Create Social Climates. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1982.

Forehand, Garlie A., and Marjorie Ragosta. A Handbook for Integrated Schooling. A report prepared under Contract No. OEC-0-73-6341, U. S. Department of HEW/OE, Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation. Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J., 1976.

Foster, G. "Elements of an Effective Desegregation Plan," presentation to Des Moines Desegregation Task Force, August 1972.

Hawley, Willis D., et al. Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies. Volume I: Strategies for Effective Desegregation: A Synthesis of Findings. Nashville, Tenn.: Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy Studies, April 1981.

Howsam, Robert B., et al. Educating a Profession. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1976.

Jencks, C. Inequality: A Reassessment of the Effects of Family and Schooling in America. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Katz, Irwin. "Review of Evidence Relative to Effects of Desegregation on the Intellectual Performance of Negroes." American Psychologist, Vol. 19, 1964.

Katz, Phyllis. Modification of Children's Racial Attitudes. New York: City University of New York, 1976. ED 135 882.

King, A. L. "The Impact of Desegregation and the Need for Inservice Education," in David L. Williams, Jr., ed., Research to Improve Family and School Life, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory Monograph Series. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1981, pp. 1-26.

Levine, Daniel U., and Robert J. Havighurst, ed. The Future of Big City Schools. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1977.

Pettigrew, Thomas F. Racially Separate or Together? New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

Rossell, Christine H. Assessing the Unintended Impacts of Public Policy: School Desegregation and Public Policy. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978.

Rossell, Christine H., et al. Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies. Volume V: A Review of the Empirical Research on Desegregation: Community Response, Race Relations, Academic Achievement and Resegregation. Nashville, Tenn.: Center for Education and Human Development Policy, Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University, April 1981.

St. John, Nancy H. "Desegregation and Minority Group Performance." Review of Educational Research, 40, February 1970, pp. 111-134.

St. John, Nancy H. School Desegregation: Outcomes for Children. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1975.

Stollee, M. "Integrated Education: Past and Future Perspectives of Research." A paper presented to the Urban Education National Conference, "From Desegregated Schools to Integrated Education," Milwaukee, July 9, 1979.

Ways to Improve Education in Desegregated Schools. Handbook for Inservice Education: Guidelines for Training, Multicultural Education, and Desegregation. Austin, Texas: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1982.

Weinberg, Meyer. Assessment of Current Knowledge about the Effectiveness of School Desegregation Strategies. Volume IV: A Practical Guide to Desegregation: Sources, Materials, and Contacts. Nashville, Tenn.: Center for Education and Human Development Policy. Nashville, Tenn.: Institute for Public Policy Studies, Vanderbilt University, April 1981.

Westbrook, John D. Considering the Research: What Makes an Effective School? Austin: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1981.